



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,590	03/14/2000	Philip R Krause	READ-REL-CIP-031400	8636
35197.	7590	12/03/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIP R KRAUSE 9437 SEVEN LOCKS RD BETHESDA, MD 20817			NGUYEN, CHAUT	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2176		

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/524,590	KRAUSE, PHILIP R	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Chau Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 36-69 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 36-69 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Response, received on 09/16/2004, has been entered. Claims 36-69 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 36-41 and 43-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sotomayor, Patent No. 5,708,825 and further in view of Meske, Jr. et al. (Meske), Patent No. 5,530,852.

4. As to claims 36, 68 and 69, Sotomayor discloses a method for using a computer system, in response to a reader's request for display of electronic text, to automatically identify and provide additional reading material related to concepts referred to within said electronic text comprising, in sequence, the steps of:

- a) accessing, using the reader's computer, electronic text requested for display by the reader, said electronic text containing at least one text section (col. 5, line 53 – col. 7, line 10: a viewer viewing documents uses a web browser to access the documents that a database provider may make available on the network, each document might have plurality of pages, and each page contains a portion of a source document);
- c) automatically searching an index, wherein
  - i) said index contains a plurality of terms by which it may be searched (col. 3, line 41 – col. 4, line 8);
  - ii) substantially all terms in said index are associated with at least one pointer to a text section (col. 3, line 41 – col. 4, line 8 and col. 15, lines 48-67 and Abstract); and
  - iii) at least one term in said index is associated with a plurality of pointers, at least two of said plurality of pointers pointing to different text sections (col. 3, line 41 – col. 4, line 21) ;

Sotomayor provides viewer with an indexed and/or hyperlinked view of a document wherein a viewer can view and search for text strings having important key topics marked and indexed (col. 35, lines 48-57). However, Sotomayor does not explicitly disclose b) using said at least one text section to automatically formulate, on the reader's computer, a search request related to a concept

referred to in said at least one text section; d) responsive to step (c), automatically identifying additional reading material related to said concept; and e) automatically displaying on said reader's computer display, an indicator of said additional reading material together with at least one link to a source of said additional reading material, side-by-side with a portion of the electronic text referred to in step (a). Meske Jr. discloses a method for retrieving information by displaying to a user a display generated from a first markup language containing a list of profiles and at least one corresponding topic for each of the list of profiles and allowed user to enter search term, and the search is performed using the search term in a database which is organized by the list of the profiles and the at least one corresponding topic for each of the list of profiles (col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 8). Meske Jr. also discloses the search result may also create certain HTML files responsive to user search requests and additional HTML files created responsive thereto, wherein anchors are created in the various files in order to allow hypertext cross-referencing of the various related file and/or documents (col. 5, lines 58 – col. 7, line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meske Jr. and Sotomayor to include using said at least one text section to automatically formulate, on the reader's computer, a search request related to a concept referred to in said at least one text section; automatically identifying additional reading material related to said concept; and automatically displaying on said reader's computer display, an indicator of said additional reading material together with at least one link to a source of said additional reading material,

side-by-side with a portion of the electronic text referred. Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing.

5. As to claim 37, Sotomayor and Meske Jr. (Sotomayor-Meske) disclose wherein said additional reading material of step d is accessible over a network (Sotomayor, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 17 and Meske Jr. discloses a method for retrieving information by displaying to a user a display generated from a first markup language containing a list of profiles and at least one corresponding topic for each of the list of profiles and allowed user to enter search term, and the search is performed using the search term in a database which is organized by the list of the profiles and the at least one corresponding topic for each of the list of profiles (col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 8). Meske Jr. also discloses the search result may also create certain HTML files responsive to user search requests and additional HTML files created responsive thereto, wherein anchors are created in the various files in order to allow hypertext cross-referencing of the various related file and/or documents (col. 5, lines 58 – col. 7, line 2)).

6. As to claim 38, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said network is the internet (Sotomayor, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 17).

7. As to claim 39, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises selecting certain words from said text section, wherein said index includes words present in other text sections, and wherein said additional reading material contains all words in said search request (Meske, Figs. 8 and 9, col. 10, line 41 – col. 11, line 5: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing).

8. As to claim 40, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises analyzing said text section for the presence of combinations of certain words in a specific order and within a specified proximity of one another wherein said index includes words from other text sections, and wherein said additional reading material contains the same combinations of certain words in said specific order and within said specified proximity of one another (Sotomayor, col. 4, lines 11-48; Meske, col. 5, line 58 – col. 6, line 14).

9. As to claim 41, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises analyzing said text section for

patterns of word usage that are recognized by the computer system to relate to a concept (Sotomayor, col. 4, lines 10-21).

10. As to claim 43, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises analyzing said text section for citation of references, and wherein said additional reading material cites at least one source cited by said text section (Meske, col. 11, lines 11-29).

11. As to claim 44, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises analyzing said text section for embedded commands (Sotomayor, col. 6, lines 18-48).

12. As to claim 45, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises statistical analysis of word usage within said text section (Sotomayor, col. 15, lines 48 – 67).

13. As to claim 46, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises identifying an index entry referring to said text section (Sotomayor, col. 15, lines 48-67).

14. As to claim 47, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said search request is contained in a list of potential search terms (Sotomayor, col. 15, lines 48-67).

Art Unit: 2176

15. As to claim 48, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said search request comprises words within said text section of step (a) (Meske, Figs. 9 and 10, col. 10, line 41 – col. 11, line 5: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing).

16. As to claim 49, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said search request comprises a plurality of words (Meske, Figs. 9 and 10, col. 10, line 41 – col. 11, line 5: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing).

17. As to claim 50, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said search request comprises a synonym of at least one word in said text section (Sotomayor, col. 17, lines 5-18).

18. As to claim 51, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said additional reading material is related to said section of text by discussion of identical concept (Sotomayor, col. 9, line 26 – col. 10, line 22).

19. As to claim 52, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said additional reading material is related to said section of text by discussion of concepts that are related to one another (Sotomayor, col. 9, line 26 – col. 10, line 22).

20. As to claim 53, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said concepts are considered related to one another when both are related to a third concept (Meske, Abstract: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing).

21. As to claim 54, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said concepts are considered related to one another when one is included within the other (Sotomayor, col. 9, line 26 – col. 10, line 22).

22. As to claim 55, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said index is an author's index to said requested text (Sotomayor, col. 17, line 50 – col. 18, line 36).

23. As to claim 56, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said index is generated automatically by a computer system (Sotomayor, Abstract).

24. As to claim 57, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said index is a search engine (Sotomayor, col. 35, lines 48-57).

25. As to claim 58, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said index is accessed via a computer network (Sotomayor, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 17).

26. As to claim 59, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said display occurs in a browser window (Sotomayor, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 17).

27. As to claim 60, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said indicator of additional reading material is an excerpt of said additional reading material (Sotomayor, col. 9, line 26 – col. 10, line 22).

28. As to claim 61, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the indicator of additional reading material is an index term (Sotomayor, col. 9, line 26 – col. 10, line 22).

29. As to claim 62, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the computer system obtains input from the reader regarding the types of relationships between

references to concepts to provide information about in step (d) (Sotomayor, col. 6, lines 18-48).

30. As to claim 63, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein the computer system obtains input from the reader regarding the strength of relationships between related concepts to provide information about (Sotomayor, col. 6, lines 18-48).

31. As to claim 64, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said indicator of additional reading material is displayed on an outline of at least one text (Meske, Abstract and Figs. 9-11: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing).

32. As to claim 65, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said index to be searched may be selected by the reader (Sotomayor, col. 35, lines 48-57).

33. As to claim 66, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein additional information resident on the reader's computer influences said search request (Meske, Abstract and Figs. 9-11: Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of

information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing).

34. As to claim 67, Sotomayor-Meske disclose wherein said text requested by the reader is obtained via a computer network (Sotomayor, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 17).

35. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sotomayor and Meske as applied to claims 36-41 and 43-69 above, and further in view of Buguraev, Patent No. 6,212,494.

36. As to claim 42, Sotomayor-Meske disclose the limitations as discussed above. However, Sotomayor-Meske do not explicitly disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises analyzing the frequency with which at least one word appears in said text section relative to other words. Buguraev discloses a method for creating a catalog comprising key terms, properties thereof, relations involving those key terms for a given topic comprises clustering key terms on the basis of proximity in terms of their relative position in the text (col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 48). Since Buguraev teaches a method for creating a glossary, index, help database or the like, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the index method of Buguraev into the search system of Sotomayor-Meske to include gathering key terms on the basis of proximity in

terms of relative position in the text. By doing so, it would create an online help database useful in providing online assistance to users in performing a task.

### ***Response to Arguments***

In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

A) "Combination of Sotomayor and Meske in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not result in the claimed invention." (see page 5 of remarks)

As to claim A), Sotomayor discloses a method for using a computer system, in response to a reader's request for display of electronic text, to automatically identify and provide additional reading material related to concepts referred to within said electronic text comprising, in sequence, the steps of:

- a) accessing, using the reader's computer, electronic text requested for display by the reader, said electronic text containing at least one text section (col. 5, line 53 – col. 7, line 10: a viewer viewing documents uses a web browser to access the documents that a database provider may make available on the network, each document might have plurality of pages, and each page contains a portion of a source document);
- c) automatically searching an index, wherein

- i) said index contains a plurality of terms by which it may be searched (col. 3, line 41 – col. 4, line 8);
- ii) substantially all terms in said index are associated with at least one pointer to a text section (col. 3, line 41 – col. 4, line 8 and col. 15, lines 48-67 and Abstract); and
- iii) at least one term in said index is associated with a plurality of pointers, at least two of said plurality of pointers pointing to different text sections (col. 3, line 41 – col. 4, line 21) ;

Sotomayor provides viewer with an indexed and/or hyperlinked view of a document wherein a view can view and search for text strings having important key topics marked and indexed (col. 35, lines 48-57). Although, Sotomayor does not explicitly disclose b) using said at least one text section to automatically formulate, on the reader's computer, a search request related to a concept referred to in said at least one text section; but Sotomayor discloses automatically generating home pages containing various types of index information and the associated hyperlinks to other information located on the Internet and the web (col. 4, lines 4-8), automatically identifying significant key topics (indexed key topics), concepts, and phrases in the document to create summary pages and hyperlinks between these key topic (col. 4, lines 11-48), and the summary page contains key-topic index entries that include hyperlinks to destination anchors where those key topics appear in the presentation page generated from source document (col. 8, lines 44-62) and when a user clicks on

the key-topic index term to read more information about that key-topic index term (col. 6, lines 31-48), thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to comprehend that clicking on the key-topic index term to read more information about that key-topic is considered as "a search request related to a concept referred to in one text section". However, to make it more clear, Examiner introduced Meske reference, which discloses a method for retrieving information by displaying to a user a display generated from a first markup language containing a list of profiles and at least one corresponding topic for each of the list of profiles and allowed user to enter search term, and the search is performed using the search term in a database which is organized by the list of the profiles and the at least one corresponding topic for each of the list of profiles (col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 8). Meske Jr. also discloses the search result may also create certain HTML files responsive to user search requests and additional HTML files created responsive thereto, wherein anchors are created in the various files in order to allow hypertext cross-referencing of the various related file and/or documents (col. 5, lines 58 – col. 7, line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meske Jr. and Sotomayor to include using said at least one text section to automatically formulate, on the reader's computer, a search request related to a concept referred to in said at least one text section; automatically identifying additional reading material related to said concept; and automatically displaying on said reader's computer display, an indicator of said additional reading material together with at least one link to a

source of said additional reading material, side-by-side with a portion of the electronic text referred. Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing.

B) "Even if combination of the references arrived at the present invention, it is inappropriate to combine the cited references in the manner suggested." (see page 6 of remarks)

As to point B), in response to applicant's argument that "Even if combination of the references arrived at the present invention, it is inappropriate to combine the cited references in the manner suggested", the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In this case, since Meske discloses the receipt of a plurality of information organized by profile and topic and parsing information into portions including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing

and accessing, which is similar to identifying significant key topics, concepts, and phrases in a document and creating hyperlinks between key topics, thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meske Jr. and Sotomayor to include using said at least one text section to automatically formulate, on the reader's computer, a search request related to a concept referred to in said at least one text section; automatically identifying additional reading material related to said concept; and automatically displaying on said reader's computer display, an indicator of said additional reading material together with at least one link to a source of said additional reading material, side-by-side with a portion of the electronic text referred. Meske Jr. provides information retrieval, which includes the receipt of a plurality of information, organized by profile and topic in a first markup language, and the parsing of the plurality of information into portions of information in a second markup language, including anchors referencing each of the portions of information to allow hypertext viewing and accessing

C) "No motivation to combine Sotomayor, Meske, or Buguraev is described in the O.A." and "Sotomayor, Meske, and Buguraev are individually complete, and solve different problems from the present invention". (see pages 7-8 of remarks)

As to point C), in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art

to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Sotomayor-Meske do not explicitly disclose wherein the method of formulating said search request comprises analyzing the frequency with which at least one word appears in said text section relative to other words. Buguraev discloses a method for creating a catalog comprising key terms, properties thereof, relations involving those key terms for a given topic comprises clustering key terms on the basis of proximity in terms of their relative position in the text (col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 48). Since Buguraev teaches a method for creating a glossary, index, help database or the like, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the index method of Buguraev into the search system of Sotomayor-Meske to include gathering key terms on the basis of proximity in terms of relative position in the text. By doing so, it would create an online help database useful in providing online assistance to users in performing a task.

D) "Sotomayor teaches away from the present invention and from combination with Meske." (see page 9 of remarks)

As to point D), this argument is as the same as argument in point A, please see response to point A above.

E) "Rejections of dependent claims are inappropriate." (see page 9 of remarks)

As to point E), please see the rejection of claim 37 of additional information added into the rejection of claim 37 above.

37. Applicant's arguments filed 09/16/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see the response to arguments above.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The examiner can normally be reached at 8:00 am – 5:00 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3230.

Art Unit: 2176

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20131

**Or Faxed to:**

(703) 872-9306, (for **formal communications**; please mark

**"EXPEDITE PROCEDURE"**).

**Or:**

(703) 746-7240 (for **informal or draft communications**, please

label

**"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"**).

**Or:**

(703) 872-9306 (for **After Final Communications**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121  
Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Chau Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2176

  
JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER